prayed that the records may be ordered to be kept in the courts at least for one year after their disposal.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. Measures to save delay in sending references will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 24.

Noting the date of disposal in the copy applications to be dispensed with.

Mr. Suryanarayana Rao, Tumkur taluk.

Summary of discussion.—When applications for copies are presented to civil courts, the applicants are required to note therein the date of disposal of cases. There appears to be no difficulty in having the records if the number and the year are quoted in such applications. It is requested that the noting of the date of disposal of cases may be dispensed with.

Reply of Government.—The rules do not insist on the date of disposal being given. Individual representations may be made in regard to cases where this is required to be done to the courts concerned.

SUBJECT No. 25.

Court sales.

Mr. K. Krishnamurti Rao, Magadi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—Revenue and civil court sales which are at present conducted by Nazirs and other low paid officials without proper advertisement may be caused to be conducted through recognized agents on payment of 5 per cent commission on the sale proceeds.

Mr. K. Krishnamurti Rao pointed out two or three cases where properties were said to have been knocked down for low bids.

Messrs. Venkatachar and *Narasimhachar* represented on the other hand that there were sufficient provisions for setting aside a sale if there was no publication of proclamation, that the existing rules caused enough of delay and worry to decree holders and that the measure proposed would introduce further difficulties.

Reply of Government.—Not feasible.

Mr. Channakesavaiya made a request incidentally that time to present applications under Order XXI, Rule 89, might be extended to two months.

Reply thereon.— Noted.

SUBJECT No. 26.

Issue of cheques to parties in civil cases without the signatures of the lawyers.

Mr. Hutchaveere Gowda, Gubbi taluk.

Summary of discussion.—The civil courts insist upon the necessity of obtaining the signatures of the lawyers to cheque and cash books before the issue of cheques to the parties. This was not in vogue four or five years ago. It is therefore prayed that this practice may be stopped as it causes much inconvenience to the parties.

Reply of Government.—It is insisted upon for purposes of identification whenever necessary. It is sufficient if reliable witnesses are produced for identifying the parties concerned.

SUBJECT No. 27.

Copying paper.

Messrs. Viswanatha Setti, Channapatna municipality, Venkata-

Summary of discussion.—The price of copying paper is heavy. It is not provided with as many cages as are enough to copy out the number of words which were be-

ramanaiya, Channapatna taluk, Gundappa, Magadi taluk, T. Ramachandra Rao, Bangalore District Board, Hutchveere Gowda, Gubbi taluk, Herur Gundappa and Channappa, Kunigal taluk, Ramachar, Kolar municipality, M. Venkatakrishnaiya, M. C. Rangaiengar, Amble Anniah Pandit and Banumaiya, Mysore city municipal council; Chandrasekharaiya, Nanjangud taluk, K. Thammiah and Kesavadasiengar, Belur taluk.

ing written for the same amount. Besides, a copy containing even two words costs as much as one of 100 words. It is therefore prayed that orders be issued allowing copies to be written on both sides of the paper or to increase the number of words to be written on a sheet by doing away with the rule "that not more than 100 English words and 125 Kannada words should be written" and by substituting, if necessary, the words, "that not less than 100 English words and 125 Kannada words." The cost of the paper may be reduced.

Some of the members observed that the parties had now to pay more but the number of words they got was less.

Reply of Government.—Noted for consideration. The question of increasing the number of words that might be written on each page will be considered.

SUBJECT No. 28.

Batta to witnesses.

Messrs. Lingappa, Chitaldrug municipality, and Munisamappa, Devanhalli municipality.

Summary of discussion.—Witnesses attending criminal courts may be given batta just as in civil courts.

Mr. Ramachar.—The same reasons which apply to payment in civil cases apply to criminal cases also and sometimes parties pay witness batta. He prayed that payment might be enforced.

Mr. V. Raghavachar observed that in summons and sessions cases it was proper to pay but not in other cases.

Reply of Government.—Not feasible for the present.

SUBJECT No. 29.

Acceptance of *vargarajinamas* by Sub-Registrars.

Mr. Chandrasekhariah, Nagamangala taluk.

Summary of discussion.—*Vargarajinamas* presented along with the instruments of conveyance are accepted by the Sub-Registrars. They may also be ordered to be accepted if presented along with the Instruments of Gift, Agreement, Release and Partition.

Reply of Government.—A circular has been issued to all Registering Officers to accept *vargarajinamas* in all cases of absolute transfers of lands.

SUBJECT No. 30.

Sale of general stamps by village servants.

Mr. C. Chennakesaviah, Krishi Silpabhi Vardhaka Samaj, Chitaldrug.

Summary of discussion.—Though the Stamp Act came into force long ago, the number of plain paper documents has not decreased especially in the Chitaldrug district and the payment of duty and penalty levied in courts is increasing. The raiyats urge in defence that they cannot get stamps whenever they want them in their villages. The sale of general stamps may be ordered to form part of the patel's duty in all villages allowing him the usual commission. Where the patel is illiterate, the shanbhog may be ordered to do that duty in those villages. The minimum value of stamp papers that he should have may be fixed at Rs. 10 or 15. By granting this facility and by instituting prosecutions in suitable cases in which plain paper is used, the number of plain paper documents will be lessened.